

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 095 518

88

CS 001 327

TITLE Reading Diagnostic Center. Second Interim Evaluation Report Period from July 1, 1972 to June 30, 1973.

INSTITUTION Lincoln Univ., Jefferson City, Mo. Lab. School.

SPONS AGENCY Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.; Missouri State Dept. of Education, Jefferson City.

PUB DATE Aug 73

NOTE 19p.

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.75 HC-\$1.50 PLUS POSTAGE

DESCRIPTORS Behavioral Objectives; Reading; Reading Ability; Reading Centers; Reading Clinics; *Reading Diagnosis; Reading Improvement; *Reading Instruction; *Reading Programs; *Remedial Reading; *Remedial Reading Clinics

IDENTIFIERS Elementary Secondary Education Act Title III; ESEA Title III

ABSTRACT

This paper reports on the progress of the Reading Diagnostic Center at Llincoln University during the year 1972-73. The contents include: "Introduction," which reports on the total (public and nonpublic) students exposed to the center; "Objectives, Activities and Evaluation Plans," which presents the objectives, evaluation, and results of diagnosis; "Remedial Reading Cases," which discusses the objectives, activities, and evaluation of students identified as remedial readers; "Corrective Reading Cases," which discusses the objectives, activities, and evaluation of students identified as corrective reading cases; "Inservice Training for Teachers," which discusses the objectives, activities, and evaluation of inservice teachers; "Inservice Program for Teachers," which discusses the procedures used for working with teachers on an individual basis; "1973 Lincoln University Workshop," which discusses a one-week workshop aimed at teachers learning about new trends, techniques, and resources available to them for reading instruction; and "Dissemination of Information about the Use of the Project," which lists the various ways in which information was disseminated.

(WR)

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT
OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

READING DIAGNOSTIC CENTER

CS

Second Interim Evaluation Report

Period From

July 1, 1972 to June 30, 1973

Date Report Filed: August 29, 1973

LEA: Lincoln University Laboratory School
Lincoln University
Jefferson City, Mo. 65101

RECEIVED

AUG 31 1973

ED 095518

CS 001 327

INTRODUCTION

During the year 1972-73 diagnosis has been completed on 125 students. Fifty-five of those have had the second series of test to determine the reading index after remediation.

Total students exposed to the Center showing public and non-public:

Public

Total 100

- 48 - Totally Tested (Two Reading Indexes)
- 50 - One Reading Index
- 2 - Partially Tested by Request (eyes, ears, et.)
- 81 - Finished Summer Remediation Started in June 1972
- 31 - Summer Remediation Started in June 1973

Non-Public

Total 27

- 7 - Totally Tested (Two Reading Indexes)
- 20 - One Reading Index
- 18 - Finished Summer Remediation Started June 1972

Workshop for Teachers

- 84 - Teachers have attended a one week workshop at Lincoln University (discussed later)
- 5 - Visitors

Referrals Made and Follow-ups

	Eyes	Ears	Personality Psychiatrist & Psychologist	Medical
Referred	50	13	31	14
Follow up by parents	19	8	19	11

CHART A

INFORMATION ON STUDENTS WITH AGES UNDER 11
(Students with two reading indexes)
(Totals 1971-72 - 1972-73)

I.Q.	No. Cases	Reading Index		% of Change	
		Begin.	Ending	+	-
Under 70	0				
70-79	4	.62	.68	10	
80-89	13	.66	.70	6	
90-99	30	.66	.68	3	
100-110	23	.58	.68	17	
Over 110	14	.70	.79	13	
Total	84	.64	.71	10	

CHART B

INFORMATION ON STUDENTS WITH AGES OVER 11
(Students with two reading indexes)
(Totals 1971-72 - 1972-73)

I.Q.	No. Cases	Reading Index		% of Change	
		Begin.	Ending	+	-
Under 70	1	.56	.68	21	
70-79	6	.74	.67		9
80-89	10	.66	.74	15	
90-99	13	.62	.71	15	
100-110	3	.69	.73	6	
Over 110	2	.68	.76	12	
Total	35	.65	.72	10	

As shown in Chart A (Ages Under 11) the Average increase in Reading Index was 10%. Chart B (Ages Over 11) shows the same increase (10%).

OBJECTIVES, ACTIVITIES AND EVALUATION PLANS

I. Diagnosis

A. Objective

1. Of the target group of 1014 there will be 336 diagnosed and prescriptions written in the year 1972-73.
2. Time involed; staff of 4½ can evaluate about 7 per week.
3. Learning outcome; students will gain 10% in Reading Index in one semester.

B. Activities

1. Capacity will be measured by an individual intelligence test; current reading grade level as measured by a battery of standardized reading achievement tests; levels of reading as measured by an informal reading inventory; visual efficiency measured by the Keystone Visual Survey; auditory efficiency measured by a Pure Tone Audiometer; perceptual abilities measured a battery of tests suitable for this purpose.

Tests used at the Center are:

Keystone Telebinocular Test
Beltone Audiometer Test
Informal Reading Inventory, McCarthy
Metropolitan Reading Achievement Test
Doren Reading Diagnostic Test
Stanford Achievement Tests
Boehm Test of Basic Concepts
Benton Revised Visual Retention Test
Wepman Auditory Discrimination Test
Gray Oral Reading Test
Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test
Bender Visual Motor Gestalt Test
Draw A Man and Draw A Woman
Slosson Intelligence Test
Stanford Binet
Weschler Intelligence Scale for Children
Peabody Achievement Test
Goldman, Fristoe, Woodcock Test
Berry Visual Perception Test
Slosson Drawing Coordination Test
Nelson-Denny Test

- 4
2. Psychologist is used when necessary to diagnose emotional problems.
 3. Psychiatrist service are used when the need for additional diagnosis is evident.

C. Evaluation

1. Periodic re-evaluation will made to determine improvement made.
2. Visits will be made to schools to see if prescription is being carried out.
3. The value of the diagnosis and prescription will be determined by the results obtained.
4. The students will increase his reading index 10% or more.

D. Results of Diagnosis

1. During the time the project has been in operation 256 students were diagnosed.
2. Re-evaluation was made on 74 cases to determine improvement made. The others will be completed next year.
3. Visits were made to schools to see if the prescription was being carried out.

The following charts show the results of diagnosis.

DISTRIBUTION OF STUDENTS BY I.Q.
AND BEGINNING READING INDEX
(All ages combined)

I.Q.	No. Students with Beginning Reading Index .79 and Under	No Students with Beginning Reading Index .80 and Above
Under 70	6	4
70-79	12	5
80-89	42	11
90-99	53	17
100-109	38	16
Over-109	31	21
Total	182	74

II. Remedial Reading Cases

A remedial reading case is defined as one whose reading index is 0.79 or below.

A. Objective

1. During the second semester 25-35 students will be remediated at the Center.
2. During the summer 100 to 150 students will be in the remedial program at the Center.
3. Most Remedial students will be referred back to the schools for remediation.
4. All groups referred to above will progress on the Reading Index at least 10% in four months.

B. Activities

1. Following diagnosis, a remedial reading case will be referred to the remedial reading teacher of his school, where there is one, along with a prescribed program of reading instruction based on the diagnosis. Where there is no remedial reading teacher in the school, the remedial reading case will be assigned to a remedial reading teacher in the Diagnostic Center, along with a prescribed program of reading instruction based on the diagnosis.

Such cases will be worked with on an individual basis, or a "two-to-one" ratio of pupils and teacher. Where there is a remedial reading teacher in the school, pupils will be assigned to them. The more severe cases will be worked with in the Diagnostic Center. In each instance a recommended program, based on diagnostic results, will be presented.

2. At the Center, materials and machines (books, tapes, pictures, System 80, Hoffman Reader, Language Master, Mini tapes, slides, filmstrip, records, and other) will be used to develop interest and promote learning.
3. The Reading Diagnostician of the Center will confer regularly with the reading teacher in the school to check on the effectiveness of the prescribed program of instruction. The program will be modified in the light of the progress of the pupil.

C. Evaluation

Students will be re-tested to determine if they have made the prescribed 10% gain and determine areas of strength and weakness.

(Totals 1971-72 - 1972-73)
 Remedial Cases (Reading Index .79 and below)
 Students Grouped by I.Q. Showing the Beginning, Ending Index,
 Per Cent of Change, and the Number of Cases in Each Group

Ages 6 - 11

I.Q.	Under 70	70-79	80-89	90-99	100-109	Over 110
Number of Cases	0	4	9	21	22	10
Average Reading Index Beginning		.62	.56	.56	.63	.59
Ending		.68	.64	.58	.68	.68
Average % of Change		10	14	4	13	15

Total increase 10.5%

Chart D

(Totals 1971-72 - 1972-73)
 Remedial Cases (Reading Index .79 and below)
 Students Grouped by I.Q. Showing the Beginning, Ending Index,
 Per Cent of Change, and the Number of Cases in Each Group

Ages 11 - 17

I.Q.	Under 70	70-79	80-89	90-99	100-109	Over 110
Number of Cases	1	3	7	10	1	2
Average Reading Index Beginning	.56	.58	.55	.55	.43	.68
Ending	.68	.53	.63	.70	.54	.76
Average % of Change	21	-9	15	27	26	12

Total increase 18%

Charts A and B show that there seems to be very little difference in reading improvement in the different age groups. However, when we divided the students with reading indexes at 79 and below the other group of over 79 index, we find that in the 79 and below groups; age group 6-11 had an average increase of about 10.5% (chart C) and the age groups 11-17 increased over 18% (chart D) most of the students in the above are in remedial reading classes.

III. Corrective Reading Cases

A corrective reading case is defined as one whose reading index is 0.80 to 0.90.

A. Objective

Given a corrective reading case as defined above, with at least one semester of reading instruction prescribed by the Lincoln University Diagnostic Center, he will increase his reading index by at least ten percent.

B. Activities

Following diagnosis, each corrective reading case will be referred back to his regular classroom teacher along with a recommended program of reading instruction based on the diagnosis.

The Reading Diagnostician of the Center will confer regularly with the reading teacher in the school to check on the effectiveness of the prescribed program of instruction. The program will be modified in the light of the progress of the pupil.

C. Evaluation

Test will be given at the end of one semester to determine if the student has progressed 10% on the reading index.

(Totals 1971-72 - 1972-73)
 Corrective Reading Cases (Reading Index 80 and over)
 Students Grouped by I.Q. Showing the Beginning, Ending Index,
 Per Cent of Change, and the Number of Cases in Each Group

Ages 6 - 11

I.Q.	Under 70	70-79	80-89	90-99	100-109	Over 110
Number of Cases	0	0	4	9	1	4
Average Reading Index Beginning			.90	.88	.91	.97
Ending			.82	.90	.86	1.04
Average % of Change			-9	2	-5	7

Total increase under 1%

Chart F

(Totals 1971-72 - 1972-73)
 Corrective Reading Cases (Reading Index 80 and over)
 Students Grouped by I.Q. Showing the Beginning, Ending Index,
 Per Cent of Change, and the Number of Cases in Each Group

Ages 11 - 17

I.Q.	Under 70	70-79	80-89	90-99	100-109	Over 110
Number of Cases	0	3	3	3	2	0
Average Reading Index Beginning		.91	.91	.87	.83	
Ending		.83	.96	.70	.84	
Average % of Change		-9	8	-20	1	

Total decrease 6%

As stated before it appears that the age groups are much the same in improvement and that the students with under 80 reading index made more improvement than we had predicted. However, in the group with the reading index of 80 and over; the age group 6-11 had less than 1% increase (chart E) and the 11-17 age groups decreased 6% in their reading index (chart F).

Based on the preceding information it seems that the students in remedial classes have made significant improvement while those not in remedial reading classes ages 6-11 made slight improvement and the 11-17 decreased 6%. This may indicate that special reading classes should be provided for students with a reading index of 80 to 95 somewhat like that provided for those of less than 80. We realize that the sample is small and that there were no controls; therefore more research is necessary.

Also it is the thinking of the entire staff that tests now available do not adequately measure the achievement of students with low reading achievement. Therefore they are working on a new measure to be designed primarily for that group. It is hoped that it can be standardized in the future.

IV. In-Service Training for Teachers

A. Objective

To develop a program in reading for in-service teachers from schools participating in the project of the Lincoln University Diagnostic Reading Center. They will become more proficient as a result of having participated in the activities listed below.

1. Target group 433 teachers
2. Time involved 1 week in summer and 2 days during regular school and conferences with the staff from the Center.
3. Learning outcome; teachers will learn the teaching aids and how to use them.
4. Teachers will learn better methods of teaching reading.

B. Activities

1. The Lincoln University Reading Center will sponsor a one week workshop for reading teachers. Enrollees will have an opportunity to see and learn to use some of the most recent equipment, books and other materials currently used in teaching reading.

Remedial reading teachers of the area will work with the Reading Center staff and representatives of exhibiting companies in explaining and/or demonstrating the equipment, books and other materials which will be on hand. Teachers given a budget of \$200.00, \$500.00, \$1000.00 or \$2000.00 will know what to buy. This will be an excellent place to learn the best things to buy regardless of the amount of money in their budget.

2. Seminars, workshops and other activities related to reading and reading problems will be sponsored at the Center and at various schools.
3. Teachers will familiarize themselves with the equipment used in the Center for purposes of diagnosis.
4. Teachers will administer and interpret an informal reading inventory and many of the other tests used by the Center.
5. The Reading Center staff will visit with teachers in the schools in the project and determine if they are carrying out the prescribed course of action, and if they are improving teaching methods and procedure.

C. Evaluation

1. Teachers attending the summer workshop will be checked to be sure they know how to use equipment, material and supplies.
2. The Reading Diagnostician of the Center will confer regularly with the reading teachers in the schools to check on the effectiveness of the prescribed program of instruction, and the improvement of the teacher's methods and procedure.

The staff will use a check list to determine improvements.

INSERVICE PROGRAM FOR TEACHERS

During 1972-73 most of the work with teachers, other than the June Workshop, was done on an individual basis. The staff met with each teacher and counselor who was working with the various students diagnosed at the Center. Also teachers and counselors came to the Center to get information and help. Planning was difficult because of the uncertainty regarding working with the non-public group in the project area.

As shown in the following pages, the June, 1973 Workshop was attended by 66 teachers from public schools in the project. Five teachers attended from non-public schools in the project area. There were thirteen teachers and other students at Lincoln University making a total of 84.

All the schools in the project except Tuscumbia and Cedar City had teachers in the workshop.

1973 LINCOLN UNIVERSITY WORKSHOP

The Lincoln University Reading Center sponsored a one-week workshop for reading teachers the week of June 11-15, 1973. The theme for this year's workshop was "PRESCRIPTION FOR A GOOD READING PROGRAM -- Setting the Stage for Each Child to Reach His Potential". The workshop was conducted by Dr. George L. Johnson, Director, with the entire staff assisting him. Workshop sessions were held daily from 1:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. The enrollees learned new trends, techniques, and resources available to them for reading instruction.

Monday, June 11, Dr. Baron D. Conaway, Director of Diagnostic and Remedial Services, Arkansas State University addressed the group on methods of teaching reading. The meeting then broke up into four small group meetings which were conducted by the four reading specialist from the Lincoln University Diagnostic Center; Nancee Allan, Yvonne Cooper, Lula Henry and Mary Saluzzi. During these meetings, the Reading Specialists and the enrollees discussed and learned some of the different methods of teaching reading.

Tuesday, June 12, featured Dr. A. Sterl Artley, Prof. of Curriculum and Instruction, University of Mo. Columbia, for an hour speech entitled "Can It Really Be Done?" The group broke up into four small groups as follows:

Section A - Mrs. Anne Preuss, Education Instructor, Assistant Supervisor of Student Teaching, Lincoln University
"Planning the Procedure for Providing Reading for all Students".

Section B - Tom Mock, Assistant Director of Guidance Services
Missouri State Department of Education.
"Parent-Teacher Relations and Teacher-School Relations".

Section C - Mike Malone, Director of Speech and Hearing Clinic,
Lincoln University "Behavior Modification".

Section D - Pat Harrison, Learning Disabilities Instructor,
New Bloomfield School, New Bloomfield, Mo.
and
Joyce Stucker, Learning Disabilities Instructor,
New Haven School, Columbia, Mo. "Specialized
Services - Implementing Prescription".

Wednesday, June 12, featured Dick Brecht, Instructor, Learning Disabilities and Remedial Reading, Columbia Public School, Columbia, Mo., who spoke on teaching reading through subject matter areas. The group broke up into four small group meetings which presented using reading in different subject areas. The speaker and topics were: Social Studies - Donald W. Cline, Chairman of Social Studies, Brentwood High School, Brentwood Mo.; Mathematics - Dr. James Seeney, Professor, Head Department of Education, Lincoln University; and Language Arts - Ruth Mullen, Language Arts Instructor, Belair School, Jefferson City, Mo.

Thursday, June 14 presented Carl Fehrle, Professor of Education, University of Mo., Columbia, Mo., who spoke on individualized instruction. The rest of the meeting consisted of Mr. Fehrle showing films and material and demonstrating how to use them.

Friday, June 15, consisted of services of the State Department of Education. The program included Dr. Richard L. King, Coordinator, Curriculum, State Department of Education; Otis Baker, Director, Title I, State Department of Education; and Donald M. Cox, Director, Special Education, State Department of Education.

Teachers from the following schools attended the workshop.

Teachers from Schools in the Project - (66)

Jefferson City Public School	15
Linn R-II Public School	5
Centertown R-III Public School	2
Russellville R-I Public School	1
Jamestown C-I Public School	2
Blair Oaks R-II Public Schools	3
South Calaway R-II Public Schools	2
Eugene R-V Public School	6
New Bloomfield R-III Public School	5
California R-I Public School	11
Eldon R-I Public Schools	8
St. Elizabeth R-IV Public School	4
Westphalia R-III Public School	2

All project schools but three had teachers in attendance

Teachers from Public School not in the Project - (9)
(enrolled in Lincoln University Summer Classes)

Monroe City R-I	1
Dixon Elementary	1
Owensville R-II	2
Rolla Wyman School	1
Douglas, St. Louis	1
Kansas City Woodland Elementary	2
Union R-III	1

Teachers from Schools in Project Area but Services Provided by Cemrel - (5)

St. Peter's	2
Immaculate Conception	1
St. Joseph's	1
St. George, Herman	1

Miscellaneous (enrolled in Lincoln University Classes) - (4)

Cemrel	1
State Department	1
With no School	2

Total Attendance - (84)

RECEIVED

AUG 31 1973

TITUS, J. ESEA

DISSIMINATION OF INFORMATION ABOUT THE USE OF
THE PROJECT

Personal calls were made by Ben Rogers to the schools. He first talked with the superintendents then principals and remedial reading teachers.

Letters were written explaining the operation. Forms were sent to be filled out asking for student to be admitted to the Reading Diagnostic Center.

News was given to the radio stations and the newspaper.

The visits by staff members to check on the student's achievement were very effective in getting the teachers involved. The staff members had conferences with each teacher and discussed progress made and ways to make improvements. The Center will continue this next year.

The summer workshop, although was not primarily designed for dissimulation, provided the best possible information.